

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been amended to emphasize that the entire fuel cartridge is imperforate except for the top vapor exit aperture - in contrast to the structure taught as a whole by Chen, in which the basin, which the examiner (incorrectly) deems part of a 'one-piece' fuel cartridge structure, remains spaced apart from the outer periphery of the fuel container 11, as apparently necessary for the enhanced air circulation/convection to which the Chen teach is dedicated.

New claims 15/16 are directed to the fuel cartridge housing being thin metal foil.

The technician would not considered constructing the Chen fuel container of thin metal foil as the thin foil flanges may then not have sufficient strength to reliably support the filled basin introducing an additional, unacceptable safety hazard

Applicant's remarks in prior response/amendment, so far as relevant, are incorporated herein by reference.

Chen teaches that the perforated plate covering the fuel is not flat, as claimed, but intentionally corrugated to provide many side apertures in addition to top apertures to produce enhanced convection currents increasing, not restricting, the flow of oxygen and vapor.

It would be apparent to the unimaginative technician that, in normal use, the open topped cooking basin should be freely removable from the heat to permit periodic emptying and replenishment of the contents independently of the base heating element, and not rigidly joined thereto or even, as the examiner has previously proposed, by a plugging action which inherently requires an interference/force fit, requiring forcible removal with risk of spillage of both hot basin contents and fuel. Basin emptying would be seen as involving tipping or inversion which, if the basin were rigidly

joined to the base forming a one-piece structure, would also risk spillage of the liquid fuel, both approaches representing an unacceptable safety hazard.

Clearly, in view of the differences of function, structure and purpose, the unimaginative technician would be prejudiced against attempting to modify the Chen teaching to obtain the claimed invention but even if such were attempted, the claimed invention would not result without imaginative reconstruction/ modification.

Thus, the modification of Chen previously proposed by the examiner would be destructive of the functionality in the practical working environment of the invention taught by Chen as a whole, representing a different, distinct and opposite teaching which could therefore only have been constructed with the benefit of improper hindsight analysis, having previously seen the solution provided by the claimed invention.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Robert .W. J. Usher/
Robert W.J.Usher
Regn 30923 Customer 04518
Agent for the Applicant Tel:212 633 1076